

Could the gentleman comment on the fact that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) have not been in any of these meetings to which he has referred?

Mr. DELAY. Just any formal meeting of the conference that has been held, the gentlemen he has listed have been invited to those meetings. The other meetings, the informal meetings and group meetings that have been held around the Capitol, the gentleman knows are being held with people that actually want to get a bill.

We are working with those, both Democrats and Republicans, who actually want to get a bill and are serious about negotiating that bill. And it is such a complicated bill. Different parts are being negotiated by different people. The gentleman knows how a conference can work and how difficult it is to hold it together. So to the extent that people want to actually get a bill to the President's desk, they are having great and strong input in the negotiations that are going on.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, very seriously I want to tell the gentleman that any implication that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who has fought for Medicare and health care legislation longer, harder, than any member on this floor from either party, and whose father preceded him in that fight, is somehow not interested in passing a bill is inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman made a mistake if that is his premise. I want to advise him, respectfully, that he is wrong.

I also believe that Mr. BERRY and Mr. RANGEL are extraordinarily interested in passing a bill. Now, their perspective may be different. As far as we know, there have been no conference meetings in the sense of the conferees getting together and discussing differences and trying to iron those differences out in the last 2 months.

Mr. DELAY. There have been formal conference meetings, and the gentlemen that have been outlined have been invited to those meetings.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, rather than go back and forth on it at this point in time, I will be glad to ask Mr. DINGELL and Mr. RANGEL when the last meeting was that they were invited to.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I was at the last meeting; and it was last week with the President of the United States.

Mr. HOYER. That was a meeting with the President. I agree with the gentleman. It was not a conference meeting, however. It may have been a meeting with the President.

We hope that we will proceed.

The FAA conference report, we were told that that was going to be on the floor last week and this week. We understood that we would consider it this week. The rule was not brought up. Can the gentleman illuminate for the Members where that bill stands? I know the

previous week we could not find the papers, as I recall. This week we understand the papers have been found, but we did not move ahead on that. Can the Majority Leader tell us why we have not proceeded on that and what he perceives to be the future of the FAA reauthorization bill?

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As the gentleman knows, and people should take notice, that FAA activities are currently operating under the short-term continuing resolution that we passed last week. In the meantime, Chairman YOUNG and Chairman MICA are working with their Senate counterparts and the committee members on their conference committees to reach the necessary accommodations so that we can have the reauthorization signed into law before this current C.R. expires. So, work is ongoing. As soon as the agreements are made between the House and the Senate, I think we can proceed.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information because I know we need to move ahead on that authorization. If the gentleman could answer the question, however, we understand there seems to be a disagreement. However, the House passed a provision that directed that there be no privatization of the air traffic controllers. The Senate passed a provision providing that there should be no privatization of air traffic controllers. But we understand there is a difference in the conference on this issue. Can you explain to me, Mr. Leader, when the House took a position on behalf of insuring on the continued public nature of the air traffic controllers and the Senate took the same position, why there might be a difference on that issue?

Mr. DELAY. Well, I have to admit to the gentleman that I am not privy to the intricate negotiations that are going on in this bill. We are leaving that up to the chairmen that are presiding over the conference committees. So I cannot answer the question because I do not know the machinations that have been going on in detail, and I certainly do not want to mislead the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his candor on that. Each of us finds ourselves in that position from time to time. I would urge the gentleman, however, because both Houses have taken the same position on that very critical issue, in my opinion, to the security of our Nation, if you might urge the conferees at least to take that item on which apparently the House and Senate both acted in concert off the table, it might facilitate the movement of the conference.

Mr. DELAY. I will certainly advise Chairman YOUNG and Chairman MICA of the gentleman's concern.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Majority Leader for the information.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2022

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2022.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003, OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. INSLEE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 6 be instructed to confine themselves to the matters committed to conference in accordance with clause 9 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives with regard to "high-level radioactive waste" as defined in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and other provisions of Federal law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I advise other Members we do not intend to take our entire allotted time. We hope to go through this fairly expeditiously.

This is a motion brought to assure that nothing happens in the conference report that could jeopardize completion of our statutorily-mandated mission for the Department of Energy to complete the cleanup of about 100 million gallons of high-level radioactive waste now at various sites in the United States.

□ 1500

As Members know, we have created by an act of 1982, the obligation to complete a cleanup of those wastes that have been created by the Department of Defense activity, and this does refer to waste that is not commercial but rather through the Department of Defense.

In my State, for instance, there are 53 million gallons at Hanford, at Savannah River, there are several million gallons, in New York State, in Idaho, and we need to complete this cleanup. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons the concern has been expressed that in the conference committee there could be an attempt to essentially give unfettered discretion to the Department of Energy to reclassify this waste, essentially give it a different name, rather than to complete with the certain rigor and completion of the type of cleanup that is now mandated in Federal law.